

REMARKS

Claim 1-24 are pending. Claims 1-24 are rejected. Claims 1-24 remain in the case for reconsideration. No new subject matter has been added.

Objections

The claims have been amended to overcome objections specified by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heide (U.S. Patent No. 5,677,909) in view of Haarsten (U.S. Patent No. 6,574,266). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that Heide discloses a Centralized Contention Interval for a wireless communication channel that determines at a MAC sublayer a schedule of transmission sessions for exchanging data with the respective devices as per the respective reservation requests. The Examiner cites col. 5, lines 51-60 and col. 10, lines 23-43 in Heide as support. The Examiner also states that Heide identifies one of the devices from the schedule as being the next one; acquires control of the channel; and transmits the polling frame over the channel while in a DCF mode. The Examiner cites col. 10, lines 23-24 in Heide for support.

Claim 1 specifies a processor adapted to decode a reservation request from each reservation request frame that includes a return address of a Medium Access Control (MAC) sublayer of an associated device. The processor then determines at the MAC sublayer a schedule of transmission sessions for exchanging data with the respective devices as per the respective reservation requests. The processor further transmits the polling frame over the channel while in a Distribution Coordination Function (DCF) mode.

None of these limitations are suggested in Heide. In fact, Heide specifically teaches away from determining a schedule of transmission sessions at the MAC sublayer as specified in claims 1-24. For example, column 5, lines 32-40 in Heide states that the HDLC data communications protocol specification is used for all information transfer and supervisory commands. Column 5, line 61- column 5, line 13, specifies that a Destination Identifier (DID) is used for identifying the address of the station to which the frame is being sent. Heide then states that the remote stations typically receive a new DID address each time the remote station registers with the network 10. This type of address registration would not

work with a system as specified in claim 1 where each request frame includes a return address of a Medium Access Control (MAC) sublayer of an associated device.

Further, there is no suggestion at col. 10, lines 23-24 in Heide of a processor transmitting a polling frame over a channel while in a Distribution Coordination Function (DCF) mode as also specified in claim 1. Col. 10, lines 23-24 in Heide simply states that the central station would poll the remote stations in priority-level order. There is no suggestion that this polling is being performed while in a Distribution Coordination Function (DCF) mode.

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-24 of the application as amended is solicited. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Stephen S. Ford
Reg. No. 35,139

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
503-222-3613
Customer No. 20575